DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 388 95 EA 010 829

AUTHOR Schofield, Dee
TITLE Community Schools. ACSA School Management Digest, Series 1, Number 15. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 42.
INSTITUTION Association of California School Administrators.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
CONTRACT 400-78-0007
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of California School Administrators, 1575 Old Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, California 94010 ($2.75 nonmembers; $1.75 ACSA members)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Control; *Community Education; Community Involvement; Community Resources; Community School Directors; *Community Schools; Educational Finance; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Facility Guidelines; Facility Requirements; *Literature Reviews; *School Community Relationship; Shared Facilities; *Shared Services; *State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

Utilizing material in the ERIC network, this paper briefly investigates the theory, history, and current state of community schools. Planning guidelines for alternative uses of school facilities are discussed and some examples are given of effective shared facilities. Financial requirements for starting a community school and possible sources of financial support are discussed. Administration and staffing arrangements that differ from those of traditional schools are outlined. The final topic concerns the curriculum needs of community schools. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162388

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY

SCHOOLS

Dee Schofield

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
Association of California
School Administrators

ACSA School Management Digest, Number Fifteen
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 010 829
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series Number Forty-Two

Printed in the United States of America, 1978
Association of California School Administrators
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, California 94010

Additional copies are available from ACSA for $1.75, members; $2.75, nonmembers.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of California School Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of California School Administrators or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction: Emphasis on Process	1
A Brief History: Reversal of Purpose	5
Cultural Transformation or Preservation	5
Community Control	6
The Flint Program	8
The Facilities: Open to Everyone	10
Recreation and Learning Site	10
Guidelines for Planners	11
The Emerging Community/School	13
Financing the Community School	16
How Much Money Is Needed?	17
Local and Private Funding	19
State and Federal Funding Sources	21
Administration and Staffing	24
Decentralized Decision-Making	24
Group Leadership	27
The Community School Coordinator	29
The Community School Staff	31
The Curriculum: Serving Community Interests	32
Meeting Basic Life Needs	32
Traditional and Special Programs	33
Conclusion	35
Bibliography	36

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education*. *CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $62 a year from Macmillan Information, 100D Brown Street, Riverside, New Jersey 08075. Semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

FOREWORD

Both the Association of California School Administrators and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management are pleased to cooperate in producing the *School Management Digest*, a series of reports designed to offer educational leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by ACSA.

The author of this report, Dee Schofield, was co[illegible]missioned by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.

S. Lee Hawkins
President
ACSA

Philip K. Piele
Director
ERIC/CEM

INTRODUCTION: EMPHASIS ON PROCESS

> **. . . you must take the whole society to find the whole man. . . . In the divided or social state, man's functions are parcelled out to individuals, each of whom aims to do his stint of the work, whilst each other performs his. . . . The state of society is one in which the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about so many walking monsters,—a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man. Man is thus metamorphosed into a thing, into many things. . . .**
>
> *"The American Scholar"* (1837)

In terms still applicable in the twentieth century, Ralph Waldo Emerson defined a society divided against itself. Indeed, the overspecialization and lack of unified self-concept that Emerson outlined in his essay on American education is even more evident today.

In spite of well-intentioned efforts of American educators, the gap between what transpires within the school and the "real world" outside school walls still remains the central philosophical and practical problem facing education today. Not only do children find much of what they learn not applicable to their lives outside the school, but taxpayers and parents have increasingly come to believe that their money should not be spent on what they in many cases consider an outmoded, ineffectual institution—the school system.

These problems are, of course, painfully evident to the professionals involved in education. Agreement is general that education should be concerned with the individual and his adaptation to, as well as influence on, the whole of society. Educators and theoreticians also generally agree that education cannot be confined to traditional school locations and times and that instead the educative process must become expansive and inclusive enough to be available for all members of society.

But the means for rendering this theory into practice have not

always been so readily evident. Indeed, the goal-oriented nature of American educational philosophy has militated against making this theory practicable, as Kerensky points out: "The reasonableness of predetermining goals seems unassailable in today's society."

The problem with predetermined goals lies in the emphasis that must unavoidably be placed on *product*, as opposed to means or *process*. Kerensky ties this emphasis on product to the "current press for behavioral objectives in American education." He adds that "behavioristic psychology" provides the basis "on which most of our educational practices have been predicated." Whether or not minimum competencies and competency-based education are based on behavioristic psychology, these recent educational developments certainly exemplify product-oriented education.

The emphasis on product is also indicative of the post-Industrial Revolution society in which, as Emerson so aptly noted, overspecialization and compartmentalization characterize American life. This tendency to overspecialize has certainly affected the schools, as Kerensky suggests, first by assigning the task of education to a specially trained group of administrators and teachers—the "experts"—and second, by defining the recipients of that education only as children between the ages of six and eighteen.

Some educators are, of course, aware of these philosophical bases of American education, and many of them realize the inadequacy of overspecialized, product-oriented education. The solution proposed by an increasing number of educators is *community education* and its principal instrument of realization, the *community school*. Minzey defines the close relationship between the two: "Community education is the educational concept; community school is the vehicle by which many services of community education are delivered."

According to community education theorists, all men, women, and children are students. The educational system and, indeed, the entire community and its resources should exist for the people's continuing education and for the resulting improvement in the quality of their lives. Community education

philosophy thus calls for far-reaching and radical, although (according to its proponents) absolutely necessary change.

Kerensky presents community education as the primary means of emphasizing process in education, and deemphasizing static goals or products. The *community* part of community education is central to the concept: this process of education must involve the entire community, and not just "school-age" children. By involving everyone in the educative process, regardless of age, social position, or previous educational background, community education advocates offer an affirmative answer to Emerson's question, "Is not, indeed, every man a student, and do not all things exist for the student's behoof?"

As the process of learning is expanded to include all members of the community, so can the educative process include community members as teachers, expanding the teaching role beyond the exclusive realm of the "experts." As Kerensky states, "The community education concept mobilizes an entire community as teachers and learners. We have known for a long time that one of the best ways to learn is to teach. Existing certification standards have created an artificial monopoly that blocks the utilization of a wealth of human resources." The combination of teaching and learning roles offers a partial solution to the overspecialization tendencies in American education and society.

As the focal point and the most obvious manifestation of community education, the community school assumes inestimable importance. It is meant to serve as the means of translating theory into practice. Its proponents see the community school (including its teachers, students, administrators, and even its actual buildings and facilities) as representing the community in the fullest way possible and providing the means for shaping that community into a truly democratic unit. The community school can, as Minzey asserts, furnish the "technique for returning to a true participatory democracy."

The purpose of this paper is to briefly investigate the theory, history, and current state of community schools. An immense

amount of literature has been generated by community education proponents, especially by those associated with the National Community Education Association and the Michigan-based Mott Foundation and Pendell Publishing Company. In addition to publishing numerous books dealing with different aspects of community education, the Pendell Company also published the *Community Education Journal*. These publications are notable for their rousing endorsement of community education ideals; although rather one-sided in their approach, they have contributed much to the present popularity of community schools.

The current trend in the literature seems to be away from theorizing and persuasion and toward the implementation aspects of the community school concept, such as facilities usage and finance. Community education development centers, which act as information gathering and dispersal units, as well as training centers for community school personnel, have developed across the country. Approximately thirty-five states currently provide some form of financial support for community education, and federal funds have bolstered the development efforts of local community education centers. Community education thus seems to have passed from the stage of innovation into accepted practice in the form of community schools and community school programs.

A BRIEF HISTORY: REVERSAL OF PURPOSE

The community school concept as it is presently defined is, in one sense, about as American as apple pie. The proverbial "little red school house" of nineteenth-century rural America was a community school in many respects, as Hughes points out: "The school house served as the community center for all activities. The teacher sometimes lived with the families he taught, becoming familiar with their needs and desires, their abilities and expectations."

Cultural Transformation or Preservation

However, the history of the community school and community education is perhaps more complex than many realize. In its broadest definition, community education extends back as far as the Incas' "educational" programs for conquered peoples. The Incas, along with the Spanish, and more recently even the Americans, used community education as a means for transforming the social and cultural makeup of "underdeveloped countries." Scanlon, in an article published in 1959, implicitly defines community education and the community school as the means of political and cultural transformation of a native population by an outside, "technologically superior power."

It is of interest to note that this concept of community education is in many respects a distinctly American innovation, as Scanlon notes. The first community school in America was established in 1862 on the island of St. Helena, South Carolina. Although earlier community education efforts had existed in the United States, this program incorporated the first community school, including a program for "community development." The Penn School served the poor, "less-developed" society of blacks living on the island primarily by teaching the inhabitants agricultural and medical techniques. The teachers and administrators came from the mainland and represented the

dominant white culture. Thus, the pattern of cultural transformation through the community school was established quite early in America.

This concept of community education (heartily endorsed by Scanlon) also embodies much of America's post-World War II "Big Brother" attitude toward the Third World. Scanlon's superiority complex is amply evidenced by statements such as, "Historically, community education has been primarily concerned with rural areas. It has been the means by which the advances of technologically superior societies are introduced to less-developed societies." According to Scanlon, community education can be used for "good" or "bad" purposes: "We have also seen how rapid internal transformation [the result of community education] can lead to a democracy, as in the case of Turkey, or be merely used as a technique for strengthening dictatorship, as in the Soviet Union."

What is mainly of interest in Scanlon's account is the discrepancy between his concept of community education as a means of political and cultural transformation and the current concept of community education as a means of preserving the political and cultural integrity of a community. Since the 1950s, the concept of community education and the community school has done a rather drastic about-face. In these days of mistrust of large government and desire for local control, Scanlon's idea of community education has no place.

Even on an international scale, Americans are more sophisticated in their attitudes toward Third World countries; instead of "making the world safe for democracy," they are more concerned with implementing democratic principles in their own communities. The community school movement reflects Americans' desire to help themselves—to solve their own problems within their own communities—and their increasing hesitancy to look to outside sources (especially the federal government) for solutions to their problems.

Community Control

This desire for local autonomy is of course not entirely

recent. The American political system was originally founded on the desire for local control. It is, therefore, not surprising that much of the history of community schools is tied to the development of community control of schools, as Barraclough suggests.

Herrick, in her outline of the cycles in urban education, notes that the recent move to decentralization has inspired the development of both community schools and community-controlled schools. As Barraclough paraphrases her, "Political exploitation for personal profit gave way to the theory that 'professionals' should control the schools without 'outside interference' [in the form of lay community members]. The present interest in community education is a direct reaction to the failure of professionals to provide adequately for the disadvantaged." As noted above, this reaction against the "professionals" has in part inspired the development of the community school in which members of the community play a more direct role in their own education.

Community education lends itself quite readily to administration on a more localized level. Mills, in tracing the development of community control from 1840 to the early 1940s, recounts early community efforts through the schools to provide community members with services not normally available. Thus three different communities in New York City (the Irish Catholics, the Jews, and the Italians) offered health services and meal programs through the community's schools long before the present community school movement. Such programs are tied both to the evolution of community control and to the changing concept of community school.

Community control does not require that the community school be administered by those directly involved in the immediate community. For example, the city school system may administer the community schools of separate areas.

In outlining the purposes of community control of schools, Barraclough states:

> Community control, at the very least, hopes to allow the school to reflect the values and culture of the community it serves, thus facilitating the socializing function of

> education. At best, community control of schools gives the community the power necessary to improve its children's education. Ideally, community control integrates the school and the community, greatly reducing the friction between the neighborhood and the educational establishment.

The similarity between these goals of community control and the goals of the community school is indeed striking. These two concepts would seem to be inextricably mixed. Thus, both theoretically and historically, the community school involves (at least to some extent) the transference of power from outside administrative organization to inside, community-based organization.

It may be concluded that the movement toward community control of schools has historically influenced the change in the community school concept. The idea of community education as a means of cultural and political transformation by an outside force obviously is totally incompatible with the concept of community control. However, these two contradictory strands of American educational philosophy have existed side-by-side for a long time, and the friction they generate is still felt in current attempts to define the community school.

The Flint Program

Although desire for local autonomy has become increasingly widespread in recent years, the initial innovators of community education and of the community school as it is now defined evidenced this desire long before the expansionistic ideals of the 1950s. The community school movement as it now exists can be traced most directly to two men (Charles Steward Mott and Frank J. Manley) who, in 1935, started the Flint, Michigan, community school program.

The Flint program began as a local response to local social problems. As Campbell* notes, Mott and Manley "were

*References to Campbell on this and the following page are from "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement." Succeeding references are from "Community Schools: Their Administration."

wrapped up in the problems of juvenile delinquency and crime. . . . They set out to solve large social problems such as . . . poor health, unemployment and poverty," problems that their community faced directly. In 1935, at the height of the Depression, it was impossible to expect substantial aid from the federal government. So Manley and Mott set out to utilize the resources of their immediate community, specifically the schools. The result was the "lighted school." The Flint program was initially oriented toward recreational activities. Campbell states that "the schools of Flint surely have the most elaborate physical education facilities in the U.S., at least for municipalities its size." The adult education program offers a variety of courses leading to completion of the high school degree.

Mott, at one time mayor of Flint, offered the major financial backing for the commmunity school program. The Mott Foundation has since been responsible for providing much-needed financial assistance to other communities starting community schools. And in 1964, in cooperation with seven state universities, the Mott Foundation helped to initiate a graduate-level internship program for the preparation of community education leaders.

Although the contributions of the Flint pioneers are inestimable, the concepts of community education and the community school have undergone additional revision since Mott and Manley started their program. The Flint program was based primarily on the already-existing administrative structure. In the eyes of some theoreticians, programs like the Flint community school suffered from administrative topheaviness and didn't represent the kind of thorough and complete restructuring of the educational system necessary for the accomplishment of *true* community education. Such restructuring has recently been outlined by theorists such as Kerensky and Melby who, in 1971, proposed "Education II" as an alternative theoretical framework for American community education.

THE FACILITIES: OPEN TO EVERYONE

Facilities are obviously central to the success of the community school. For the educational resources of the community to be available to everyone, the school building itself must be available. Not only must the school building be kept open beyond the regular daytime schedule, but special areas designed to accommodate community activities must be accessible if citizens are to regard their school as the focal point of community society.

The community education ideal has, perhaps, come closest to realization in the area of facilities. Through shared use of existing buildings and through the construction of large, multipurpose educational centers, the concept of the community school has emerged as truly viable.

Recreation and Learning Site

School buildings have been used for community recreation since the first decade of this century, according to Passantino. With the emergence of the Flint community education program, "the 'school-recreation' amalgamation" was well established as the first formalization of the community school idea. The shared utilization of school facilities for community recreational purposes was appealing from the outset. Not only were the educational purists unoffended by purely "recreational" activities, but "communities were anxious to derive more use and benefit from their construction dollar," as Passantino states.

In these days of declining enrollment and dwindling financial resources, the economic efficiency of sharing existing school facilities for recreation and learning activities is increasingly attractive. Ringers points out that "surplus space costs money," since basic maintenance and personnel costs remain the same, even if the building is not used to capacity. He maintains that alternative use of surplus school space "provides an option to cover the overhead and non-reducing costs of an underused

building." At the same time such use promotes the commendable concept of sharing, an important component of community education philosophy.

Guidelines for Planners

Planning for alternative uses of existing school facilities, like planning new community facilities, depends on community involvement for success, according to Baillie, DeWitt, and O'Leary. In their survey of ten community education facilities programs, they discovered that such community involvement was, in itself, a benefit. It improved neighborhood morale and helped to create more positive attitudes toward education among adults.

It is absolutely essential for the planners of the community education program to define the learning and recreational activities that they intend to include in their community school before facility construction or remodeling takes place. The program and the facility in which it is to be carried out make up an organic whole; one cannot function well without the other.

Charles Clark points out that "flexibility" must be maintained on all sides, since "there is no way the planner can fully anticipate all future demands on facilities." However, it is possible to identify the areas of the school building that will probably receive the most use under a community education program, and it is the obligation of the planners to provide "the adaptability of space and furniture" necessary for expanded use.

As an initial planning step, Ringers advises determining what space is potentially available in existing buildings, since "space users tend to expand into every available inch." He cites one school district's formula for determining space availability: one room for every 23.4 elementary pupils plus 15 percent for resource rooms; all other rooms in the building are considered free for parallel use for community education purposes or districtwide programs.

Clark suggests that the community education planners be furnished with school plant inventories and maintenance records to assist them in program development. Such information

includes site data, minature plot plans, floor plans, interior room data, additions, and remodeling. Clark notes that "the interior room data is the most valuable to community education planners" because this data states room size along with the furniture or equipment kept in each room. "This data," according to Clark, "can quickly be matched to the needs indicated by the community survey" of proposed community school activities.

Clark offers some very concrete suggestions for community school planners concerning specific facility considerations. He suggests that a community room that "should belong to the community and not be considered in the programming of student day activities" be set aside. This room needs to be versatile enough to accommodate a variety of activities, and "it should have immediate access to the outside so that community use during the day will not disturb classroom activity." Clark suggests the installation of appliances such as washing machines and dryers, as well as kitchen equipment, so that the room can serve community members in a less formal (and, therefore, more flexible) way.

The gymnasium is important in the development of the community education program, since "it has also been found to be one of the best facilities for initial introduction of adults to the school." Clark recommends "multiple use" of the gym floors for various activities, including dancing and even roller skating. The additional cost for stripping and refinishing the floor more frequently is small compared to the value of involving the community in a wide variety of recreational activities.

Playgrounds and swimming pools are other potential physical recreation facilities that can be valuable in the community school. Clark recommends lighting these areas so that they may be used after dark.

Other important facilities found in almost all school buildings are the auditorium and the library. Most community education programs consider these facilities essential in planning community activities.

Clark also cautions planners to be aware of the appropriateness of furniture and air conditioning. It is unrealistic

to expect thirty full-grown adults to sit comfortably in desks intended for small elementary school children. He emphasizes that "we should not impose learning conditions on our youth that we as adults would not tolerate."

The Emerging Community/School

The "lighted school" and the utilization of existing school facilities for community activities have certain disadvantages, according to Passantino. Not only are most of the rooms in traditional school buildings designed as "monodirectional classrooms," but "a tenant-owner relationship" inevitably arises between the regular school personnel and the special program participants. These and other "limitations of time and space" have given impetus to "more ambitious sharing arrangements, cooperatively planned, integrally designed, and jointly managed."

This new concept entails providing space to house many community organizations and services under the same roof, integrating the school into a structure that also accommodates various other community needs. The new buildings that have emerged as a result of this concept reflect a "level of expanded community relationship . . . requiring more complicated planning networks and involving more varied funding sources," as Passantino states.

The Pontiac, Michigan, Human Resources Center (renamed the Dana P. Whitmer Center), and the Atlanta, Georgia, John F. Kennedy School and Community Center are perhaps the most widely publicized examples of the new "community/school" idea. Both centers carry out the community education theorists' notion of the school as the physical center for all community services.

Pontiac's Whitmer Center originated in community members' desire to provide themselves and their children "with something more than just new buildings," according to Mattheis. Deliberately amorphous at conception, the Whitmer Center evolved slowly. After five years of public hearings involving the community and national planning resources, a building program

finally took shape. According to Passantino, the Whitmer Center "became enmeshed in urban planning concerns and required the concerted effort of many planning agencies." The result was wide variety in the community services ultimately available through the center, including social and medical support services, as well as educational and recreational services.

The Whitmer Center is "considerably more than the sum of its parts," in Passantino's opinion. The center's buildings house four elementary schools, office space for ten community agencies, a medical and dental clinic, recreational facilities (including a field house and gymnasium), a library, a community lodge, a public restaurant, a theater, and facilities for day care services, as well as space for other community programs. The center is managed by a community executive board (composed of teachers and parents) and a coordinating director, with the assistance of many community service committees.

Funding sources for the Whitmer Center were varied, with money coming from the state of Michigan, the local schoolboard, and the federal government (in the form of neighborhood facilities grants, urban renewal money, and special education funds). Mattheis points out that although the expenditure for this complex was great (approximately $6 million), "the Center is providing this community with a whole array of facilities which built individually would have run into millions of dollars more."

Atlanta's John F. Kennedy School and Community Center is intended to carry out the concept of community education and cooperation in the same way as Pontiac's Whitmer Center. Atlanta's center has been funded primarily from local bond issues and private funds, with federal support playing a relatively minor part in the total construction budget. Mattheis cites this center as a good example "of a locally initiated plan for community education." When it was completed in 1971, the John F. Kennedy Center became the first of its kind in the United States.

Located in one of Atlanta's poorest areas, the center offers the consolidated services of many community agencies. The third floor of the structure is a middle school—a self-contained

unit. Pendell lists thirteen social agencies that are housed on the first two floors, including the Atlanta Housing Authority, the Atlanta Parks and Recreation Department, the Public Schools Administration for Area I, the Fulton County Family and Children Services (as well as the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services), the Atlanta Girls Club, the Housing Code Division of the Atlanta Building Department, Senior Citizens, and a day care center. Community members can go to the center not only to take care of business with governmental agencies, but to use the facility for recreational and cultural purposes.

The Pontiac and Atlanta centers and others like them provide the prototypes "for including education within, not excluding it from, other community activities," according to Passantino. These centers provide a solution to the facilities requirements of a variety of community services and at the same time destroy the "rigid time and usage patterns for building spaces" that for so long dictated school construction.

Of course not all communities can muster the finances to build such facilities as those in Pontiac and Atlanta. Instead, they must utilize existing buildings to fulfill their community education plans. But even if no new facilities are built, the school can still use its buildings to the greater advantage of all community members. Any community can encourage its members to feel free to use school facilities.

It is this attitude projected by the planners and implementers of the community school that will encourage the community to feel at home in whatever buildings exist. As Ellena states, "No longer should people—young and old alike—be repelled by 'No Trespassing' signs on school property. . . . School house doors should be open and signs everywhere should read 'WELCOME'."

FINANCING THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL

One of the most obvious questions that must be answered by any community or school district contemplating the development of community education is the question of financing. How much money is needed, and where is it to come from?

It is easy for administrators to assume that funds for community education development are hard to come by, just as funds for almost every other educational program are. Educators are painfully aware of the increasing hesitancy of taxpayers—the major source of income for the schools in this country—to support the educational system. And it is easy to understand how some educators automatically assume that any innovative education program will meet with defeat at the hands of the taxpayers.

Community education proponents argue, however, that such a defeatist attitude is not warranted in the case of community education programs. Financial support for community schools seems easier to obtain than many assume.

According to its proponents, there are two main theoretical considerations that constitute the major selling points of the community school. First, the major purpose of community education is to make the educational resources of the community available to all its inhabitants, regardless of age, background, or position; everyone stands to benefit directly from community education programs. Second, community education also aims to revise the content of education, making what is taught in the schools more relevant to the outside world; thus, the school can become a more viable institution to the members of the community.

Pappadakis and Totten point out that the very nature of community education can lead to concrete community support (in the form of money). They upbraid those educators who automatically assume that taxpayers will oppose every new

education program:

> . . . it is fair to say that, when educators point to lack of funds to implement community education practices, it is more of an excuse than a reason. There is much evidence to support the idea that, when people understand the real values of the community education approach to learning, the problem of acquiring necessary financial support melts away.

Hiemstra points out that community education is a sound investment and that citizens can come to realize that the returns are well worth the financial outlay. Investments in community education, "if of the right kinds and in the right amounts, can have economic benefits and yield even a social return on the dollar." According to Hiemstra, the economic benefits arise when, because of effective community education, the crime rate, unemployment, and delinquency go down, thus saving the community the cost of controlling these social evils. These benefits are, obviously, difficult to measure.

The financial history of the Flint community school program certainly supports the contention that citizens are more than willing to support education programs aimed at the entire community. In the twenty years before 1935 (when the community school program was initiated), the citizens of Flint had turned down every proposed tax increase for the schools. But since 1950 (when the community school program was well-established) *all* millage and bond issues for raising school taxes have passed. This example is indeed striking when contrasted with the financial plight of school districts across the United States, many of which have had to curtail basic services because of lack of funds.

How Much Money Is Needed?

The amount of money needed to start a community school program depends on how large the community wants that program to be. The costs are minimal to initiate community education on a small scale. Baillie, DeWitt, and O'Leary note that integrating social services with educational activities in the

school setting is not very expensive and that savings often result from sharing school facilities, even though administrative costs can increase.

Pappadakis and Totten record the case of one district that started a community education program without spending any additional funds. The superintendent, his administrative staff, and the principals of the individual schools "concentrated on the one-to-one, volunteer, no-organizational-change, no-expense basis." By deciding to utilize volunteers in the community, eighteen new learning services were planned and implemented with *no* additional cost to the taxpayers. Such a course is open to all communities willing to spend the time to carry out their plans. Another advantage in small-scale operations such as this one is that the response of the community to community education can be measured before large expenditures are made.

If a district decides to convert all of its schools to true community schools, additional financial outlay is necessary. Included in this increased cost are salaries for the community school director or coordinator, additional teaching and supportive staff (if necessary), and additional money for facilities operation, supplies, equipment, and so forth.

The amount spent on each of these areas of course depends on the individual district's program. Boozer points out that "the cost factor is sustantially higher in a middle school facility than in an elementary school" when the conversion to community school is made. In middle schools, as well as in high schools, "building control is more difficult." The equipment available in these schools (shop and home economics equipment, for example) is more elaborate than that found in elementary schools and, therefore, it requires more maintenance. Boozer contrasts the funds necessary for operation of one middle school with one elementary school and concludes that the middle school requires $2,300 more for one year of operation.

Totten and Manley note that the salary for the community school coordinator is the major budget item, constituting 41.9 percent of the added cost for the community school program. Other staff salary costs compose the bulk of the additional costs for the program, with facility operation and equipment making

up only 13 percent of the costs. Although these percentages will vary somewhat from district to district, the majority of the additional funds for a community school program will go for personnel expenses.

Local and Private Funding

If a community decides to establish a community school as a pilot project, in many cases local funds can be gathered to cover the additional expense. Community service organizations, as well as local businesses and individual contributions, offer a valuable source of financial support for community education on a small scale. Since the people involved in these community organizations are the ones whom the community school will serve most directly, the organizers should not underestimate the potential of these local sources.

The financial assistance that these sources can offer the school may take the form of direct contributions. Pappadakis and Totten cite one example of a district that received community school pledges of $8,000 from the Parent-Teacher Association, the Lions Club, the Women's Club, a shirt factory, a recreation company, local churches, the city commission, and other community groups. Local governmental units (county and city) can in some cases provide great financial support for community education programs. In a Michigan school district, $10,000 from a city fund surplus were appropriated for a pilot community school project.

One source of indirect financial support for community schools is the use of volunteers to carry out some of the school's programs. Volunteer help can represent great financial savings by reducing the need for paid personnel. And volunteer help also means greater community involvement in the school—one of the main purposes of community education. Pappadakis and Totten point out that "volunteer assistance of lay citizens is a big factor in local support."

In addition to utilizing volunteer help from community organizations, the school can become the focal point of these organizations' activities, providing a place and equipment for

community activities. As Boozer points out, community agencies can pay for the use of school facilities as well as plan their own programs in conjunction with the school. "The school then assumes the role of coordinator of programs within a community"—an optimal position for the community school.

Ringers advises school districts to lease extra school space to community organizations and programs to help offset costs. He estimates that, "using the prevailing rate for office space," school space might lease for $7 or $8 per square foot per year.

Another local source for community school funds is tuition and fees from the participants in the program. Boozer states that "it is estimated that the utilization of volunteer help plus the adoption of a fee plan can absorb at least 50% of the total cost of a community education program." Fees need not be high to cover most of the "supplies and materials and the direct instructional costs of the specific program," according to Boozer.

And in addition to the financial benefits of such a system, "a certain pride and increased interest results from partial self-support." The payment of fees by the citizens involved increases the commitment of the community to its community school. Pappadakis and Totten note that, although in the early days of the Flint program adult education courses were free to all students, "it was soon learned that the students preferred to pay a small fee. There is nothing like a vested interest to improve motivation."

Local financial resources are not always sufficient to begin a large-scale community education program (for example, the conversion of more than one school to community school status). As Boozer points out, "most programs in their initial stages need money from an outside source," since few school districts have extra money to be used for "experimental" purposes.

Boozer suggests that a school district set up some kind of "matching funds" arrangement with business or a private foundation to gather the money needed to start the program. It is important for the district to have some sort of initial financial stake in the development of the community school program so that "the business or foundation is convinced of the financial as

well as the philosophic interest and commitment of the local school system." The matching funds arrangement also allows the school district to maintain direct control over its program with little outside interference.

Pappadakis and Totten list some of the private and business foundations that have shown financial interest in community education. The Mott Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, the Meyer Foundation, the Corning Foundation, the Sears Roebuck Foundation, and the Ford Foundation are among the better-known private organizations that have offered financial support for the development of community schools, often in the form of "seed" grants to districts starting community education programs.

State and Federal Funding Sources

As the community education idea has become increasingly popular, funding sources other than the local community and school district have increased. Approximately thirty-five states presently provide some form of support for community education. Some states (such as Michigan, Florida, Utah, Minnesota, and Maryland) have appropriated funds to be used for the development of community education programs and to pay part of the salaries of community education coordinators. Other states (such as Oregon) are currently considering additional financial assistance for community school programs.

Pappadakis and Totten suggest that districts interested in starting community education programs contact their state department of education about potential funding sources. It may be possible for districts to receive financial support through state adult education, consumer education, health education, or vocational education funds. Boozer notes that "in many states these programs serve all students—both public and parochial," and he adds that community education programs could be one way for states to guarantee the equal schooling required under the First Amendment:

> Community education programs—designed to serve all students and adults who live within a defined area—could

> very well be a means by which public school programs could be improved and expanded and at the same time share facilities, programs, and personnel with the non-public private and parochial schools.

Pappadakis and Totten list seventeen federal acts that "have provided funding for community education programs, processes, and projects." Among them are the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I and Title III), the Adult Education Act of 1966, the Vocational Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Housing and Urban Development Act.

Much of the legislation listed by Pappadakis and Totten was enacted during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations when higher priority was assigned to domestic programs. Although the Nixon years meant a general deemphasis on all areas of education, Congress did pass in 1974 the Community Schools Act, which provided $1.5 million for program development and (in the case of colleges and universities) community education personnel training. State and local education agencies are eligible to apply for funds through this act.

Although the 1974 act expires in 1979, Congress is currently considering new legislation (the Community Schools and Comprehensive Education Act). The bill's sponsors are calling for $454 million to be available over a five-year period. Under this proposed legislation, states could apply for federal funds if they have community education plans. Also, other nonschool agencies involved in community education would be eligible for federal dollars.

Community education advocates generally greet the increasing federal interest in community education with enthusiasm. For example, Watt, noting that community education has in the past prospered without federal support, exclaims that "if the recorded growth and development by private funding and local initiative is an indication of the interest and need for community education, federal funds could bring undreamed-of growth."

However, other proponents have certain reservations about looking to the federal government for financial support for

community schools. LeTarte, for example, sees the growth of community education resulting from federal support as a mixed blessing. Among his reservations is the fear that latecomers to the community education movement will fail to adequately carry out the concepts that provide community education with "a strong, viable philosophic base." As he states, "If untrained community educators attempt to apply the principles of community education without understanding them," then "support for community education will fade rapidly." In this event, he foresees community education going the way of other federal programs (such as the Office of Economic Opportunity) whose federal support was "dropped as quickly as it was initiated."

Pappadakis and Totten note that, in the long run, financing community education must be based on "the established sources: taxation, tuition and fees, fines and forfeitures, and gifts." These sources (especially taxation at all levels of government) have traditionally provided the economic resources for education in America, and the community school should continue to look to them for funding:

> Traditional community education has drawn upon all known revenue-producing sources; modern community education will continue to do so. These sources include the taxation of property and services at local, state, and national levels. . . . There are no new categories of potential income. There are, however, untapped resources in the categories already established.

ADMINISTRATION AND STAFFING

If community education is to function as a "technique for returning to a true participatory democracy," then radical changes in traditional school administrative structures are essential, according to community education proponents such as Kerensky and Melby:

> Even though the development of new concepts of administration may be a process fraught with controversy and many difficulties, such a development is paramount if true community education is to be developed. In fact, at the present moment, there are few factors in the building of community education more important than that of bringing about the necessary changes in administrative theory and practice.

As these authors suggest, the very nature of community education calls for revision of the traditional hierarchical administrative structure found in most school systems today. The administrators of the community school must be much more in touch with their immediate community than many school administrators (and especially central office administrators) presently are. As Campbell states, "Educational administration must be taken out of its monastic atmosphere of serenity into the hard and often irritating realities in communities."

Decentralized Decision-Making

This change in administrative structure means a change from "tall" to "flat" organization, as Hughes phrases it. The current structure is "tall"—meaning that decision-making power is centralized at the top and filters down to individual schools through a many times unnecessarily complex chain of command. The basic assumption behind this kind of organizational pattern is that the personnel on the end of the chain (the teachers and even the building principals) are relatively unprepared to carry out policy (set, of course, by the central office).

Kerensky and Melby describe this vertical administrative structure as being based on military and industrial models, rather than on medical practice or innovative business management practices. They state that "our tendency has been to remove decision-making as far away from the child and the teacher as possible rather than to make the decision-making process an integral part of teaching and learning from day to day."

The difficulty with such a vertical structure is that those most knowledgeable of the problems and issues confronting the individual school and its students—the teachers and building administrators—lack the power to immediately solve those problems. It becomes impossible for the school to be truly responsive to the needs of the community it serves if its personnel lack the authority to answer those needs. Obviously such an administrative structure militates against the actualization of the community education concept and against the development of the community school as a viable, potent force in the lives of community members. As Kerensky and Melby state, "Vertical organizations, directives from the downtown office, adopted textbooks, grades, marking systems . . . all are in the way . . . obstructions to the development of a learning community."

The alternative to this kind of vertical structure is horizontal administrative organization. The major means for achieving "flat" administration is *decentralization*. As Connelly defines it, decentralization is the "removal of the decision-making process from the forbidding bureaucratic monolith, otherwise known as the central office, out to the schools, close to the children, where decision-making could be both rapid and sensitive."

To Campbell decentralization means "a loosening of relationships between the central office and teachers—a loosening of the power between principals and teachers." Decision-making power (and responsibility) is accorded those who can best define the problems (and hence know the kinds of decisions necessary), as well as identify the most feasible solutions to those problems.

Decentralization looks good on paper, as Connelly points out. Few educators would quarrel with its fundamental goal—to

improve the quality of education by streamlining the decision-making process. However, in actuality, true decentralization is much harder to implement than news releases would have the public believe, according to Connelly. In many instances, the "real purpose" of decentralization

> was to satisfy the criteria of "flury and activity," basic to holding the critics of the school system at bay on the assumption that something new and wonderful was about to take place, and to move the "heat" away from the central office and out to the area, or district superintendent who, after all, was now decentralized, and hence able to make round squares.

Of course not all school systems engaged in such underhanded public relations moves as that outlined by Connelly, but in many cases, plans for decentralization have failed simply because *true* decentralization was not achieved. According to Connelly, in many instances the area superintendent, who supposedly acquires greater decision-making power, still has no authority over personnel or the budget; the control of these two important items remains with the central office. In these cases, the superintendent has been given "the responsibility for a total spectrum of educational activities without even the commensurate authority to oversee the line function of instruction."

In other words, he has the responsibility, but not the power to carry out that responsibility. Real decentralization has not been achieved because the central administration has been unwilling to give up some of its power and to restructure its organization.

But with the implementation of the community education concept, such difficulties would be minimized, according to Connelly. The ideas of decentralization and community education are closely related, just as community control of schools (closely akin to decentralization) and community education are related. The implementation of one can lead to the coincident implementation of the other. As Connelly states, community education "may also provide us with a key to the realization of administrative decentralization. . . . It is the all-

embracing nature of the Community School Concept which causes it to require a decentralization of administration if it is to become a reality." One can lead to the other if the school system is willing to commit itself to thorough-going administrative reorganization.

Such reorganization should lead to the allotment of decision-making power to those "in the field"—the school principal, individual teachers, groups of teachers, and even parents. This power is essential if the concept of the community school as a self-contained unit serving its immediate constituency is to be carried out. Kerensky and Melby emphasize the importance of this kind of power reallocation to the implementation of the community education idea:

> . . . the individual school and community must be seen as an educational unit with the freedom to adapt its program to the people of its area with their unique problems, backgrounds, economic level and cultural experience. In this way the principal of the individual school becomes a far more important decision-maker than he has been in past practice. It also means that more of the educational decision-making process must be flattened out and delegated to the principal and to the individual teachers and groups of teachers.

Group Leadership

This decision-making power cannot be wielded in the traditional "centralized, personalized executive" fashion, according to Kerensky and Melby. Instead, true "group leadership" must become the key to community school administration. Group leadership means that instead of the leader initiating all policy ideas, the whole group takes active part in creating solutions to mutual problems. As Kerensky and Melby describe this process, "The leader is not required or expected to have all the ideas, a solution for every problem. His *know how* consists of *knowing how* to create 'the climate' in which all members of the group are encouraged to be creative."

The "collaborative" decision-making group is essential for community school administration because it allows for

integration of many people into the administrative process and, thus, carries out the essential democratic purpose of community education.

It also allows for necessary flexibility in an organization that must constantly integrate new members and their ideas into its overall program. Kerensky and Melby consider the fluctuation of the staffs of community schools a virtue: "We need an organization in which we can take in a new member today, listen to him and let him help us probe a problem. The Staff in Community Education is not sharply defined, it changes from day to day. It is more like an artists colony than like a factory."

This kind of open group administration should lead to a greater willingness to confront change and to make constructive use of it. Hiemstra points out the necessity for community school administration to change readily, adapting to the constantly altering community it serves. He even suggests that the community school add "a person, or persons, specially trained to deal with change to the staff."

In addition to the practical advantage of coping with change, the idea of group administration helps to carry out yet another important element of community education theory: the concept that teachers are learners, and the learners, teachers. Not only do group members introduce fresh ideas into the administration of the community school, they also have the opportunity to learn administrative and interpersonal skills through direct practice. For example, teachers get the opportunity to see how the other half (the administrators) operates, and conversely, administrators are more able to appreciate the role filled by the teachers.

In practical terms, the community school advisory council is one means of translating participative decision-making and group leadership into reality. The advisory council is absolutely essential to the successful implementation of the community education concept, according to Robbins and Whitaker. These authors see the council as primarily an adjunct to the community school director. As they state, "the purpose of a community advisory council is to serve as the eyes and ears of the community for the director." They list five duties of the council:

"keeping the director informed," "recommending new programs," "assisting in planning programs," "assisting in the development of a resource bank," and "assisting in 'spreading the word'." Council members are "advisors, not operators; they are the idea givers, not policy makers."

Robbins and Whitaker's version of the advisory council obviously does not embody the kind of thoroughgoing community participation in decision-making envisioned by theorists like Kerensky and Melby. But it certainly represents an increase in community input that is commensurate with community education theory.

The Community School Coordinator

Community education advocates do not imply that the administration of the community school should be without individual leadership. But such leadership should differ from the current "clerical, custodial and authoritarian" concept of school administration, according to Kerensky and Melby.

Creating innovative theory and rendering that theory into concrete practice is an essential part of the community school coordinator's role, according to Campbell. The coordinator stands halfway between the people and the central office:

> To me, the community school coordinator is the connecting link between theory and practice. He is the one person, perhaps more than any other, who interprets educational programs to the people, and then in reverse makes known to the central office the desires of people in the neighborhoods. Community school coordinators solicit grass roots thinking, stimulate grass roots action and grass roots support, and provide grass roots evaluation.

In order to accomplish the kind of "grass roots" contact with community members outlined by Campbell, the coordinator must spend much time building people's confidence in him or her. As Nance points out, the coordinator must "establish a relationship with all elements within the community built upon the highest level of trust." Thus, the coordinator, because of these responsibilities, obviously cannot fulfill many of the

functions that are normally assigned to school administrators.

The term *coordinator* can apply to two different levels of community education administration. The coordinator can either be the director of one local community school and its program (the community school coordinator) or be the overseer of all community schools within a district (the community education coordinator). When he or she is the overall project director, usually there are directors for each individual community school.

The selection process for both positions is most important if the community education program is to be fully accepted and supported by the community members. Nance is one who emphasizes community involvement in the selection of a community education coordinator. He states that many potential conflicts between the schools and the community can be avoided "if the community is included in the selection of the coordinator and in the decision to proceed with the program in the first place." In other words, the district should first ascertain the degree of community support for community education and not carry out implementation of plans unless that support is widespread. The coordinator cannot be expected to "sell" community education to community members; they must desire it of their own accord. Community support and participation are equally important for the selection of the individual community school directors, as well as for the overall program coordinator.

The duties of the community school coordinator are varied and call for the utmost flexibility and resiliency in personality. Hiemstra and Nance both see the coordinator as a teacher, in the traditional classroom and in the total administrative role. The coordinator must also be able to serve as counselor to the staff, to the students, and to their families. Whitt defines the job of director in rather expansive terms:

> The Community School Director is a motivator, an expediter, a learning specialist, a community relations expert, a master of ceremonies, a community action agent, a VISTA volunteer, an evangelist for education, a custodian and clerk, a vice-principal, a counselor, a boys' club leader, a girls' club sponsor, a friend in the

neighborhood, and a humanitarian concerned with the welfare of our society.

This catalogue of duties indicates the all-encompassing and difficult nature of the position, as well as its potential benefit to the community. The responsibilities of the job are great, but the opportunity for truly creative leadership is also great. Communities hiring a community school coordinator/director should be well-apprised of the personality traits of its applicants to ensure a wise selection.

Because of the complexity and demanding nature of the job, training the community education leader is of the utmost importance, according to LeTarte. He cites a list of ten essential areas (including organizational analysis and management, leadership theory and its application, communications theory and practice, public relations, program development, social problems analysis, and group process analysis) that community educators should master and that should be covered in any training program for community school leaders.

The Community School Staff

The teaching staff can make or break any school, and the same is true for the community school. However, in the community school the role of the teacher usually includes a wider spectrum of opportunities for helping the community and its members.

Teachers can receive assistance from volunteers and paraprofessionals, as Hiemstra suggests. The utilization of these two groups not only frees the teacher to be more innovative in his or her approach, but involves more community members in the educational process. In Flint, for example, paraprofessionals and volunteers work as school-community aides, primarily with families in low socioeconomic areas. This program is an excellent example of community members directly helping other community members, who may, in turn, help others. Volunteers and paraprofessionals can also assist in clerical duties, freeing the coordinator and school principal for more person-to-person contact.

THE CURRICULUM: SERVING COMMUNITY INTERESTS

The program of a community school depends on the needs and desires of its community. Hence, instead of a well-defined curriculum for all such schools, each community must work out its own curriculum, keeping it flexible enough to accommodate changes in community interests.

Meeting Basic Life Needs

Community education theorists believe that certain unifying concerns—concerns that all people share—should underlie community school curriculum. Olsen suggests a list of "life-activity areas" that can form the basis for the development of community education programs in any community. His list includes

- Securing food and shelter
- Protecting life and health
- Adjusting to other people
- Appreciating the past
- Enriching family living
- Engaging in recreation
- Enjoying beauty
- Asserting personal identity

A curriculum based on these concerns would be much more vital and useful than most current school curriculums, according to Olsen. Since these concerns affect all people at all times, the gap between what transpires in the school and the outside "real" world would be closed. This unification of "school" and "outside" is one of the major purposes of community education.

One way to relate the school to the outside world is to use the resources of the community in a more immediate way. Extending the number of physical places in which community school

programs are implemented helps to improve the link between the school and the community. In theory, the community becomes a classroom, and its members become students.

Traditional and Special Programs

In the past, community school programs have centered around enrichment, remediation, and recreation, as Whitt explains. He defines enrichment activities as "those that extend the school day and at the same time stretch the capabilities of individuals involved in such a way that an individual's full potential is more nearly reached." These activities include after-school art classes, crafts classes, and "curricular programs that extend beyond the school day."

Remedial activities are intended to help students of all ages reach their full learning potential. It is important for the school to provide remedial programs for young students, especially those of elementary school age. As Whitt points out, "One of the most serious problems in relation to remediation is that it is generally started too late." The community school can play a major role in saving human energy and talent by ensuring the inclusion in the educative process of those who fall behind the "norm."

As Whitt notes, the original concept of community education was based on recreation. In Flint the community school was at first seen almost wholly in terms of physical education and recreation. And even recently, some authors advise that the district setting up a community school hire a coordinator whose main professional experience is in physical education. Although the concept of the community school has been considerably refined and broadened, recreational activities still play an important role in most community schools, partly because it is through physical recreation that members of the community not normally involved in the school become interested. As Whitt points out, "Recreation is something with which we are all familiar."

In addition to these traditional community education areas, recently programs of a more socially oriented nature have evolved. Whitt lists the Mott Vocational Guidance Program,

"designed to solve the problems of convicts returning from prison to an open society," as one of these "special problem programs." These programs are all intended to improve the quality of life of members of the community. Other areas included in this category are nutrition, safety, police-community relations, voter education, and so forth.

In order for the public to be aware of the curricular offerings of the community school, as well as the other community activities taking place within the school, people must be well informed. The responsibility for information dissemination ultimately lies with the community school director. Whitt, among others, suggests that a large, easily visible calendar of events be posted in the school building. This bulletin board serves as an immediate reminder of various activities to all who enter the school.

CONCLUSION

The theoretical and rhetorical excesses of some of the earlier community education literature seem to be stripped away in application. For example, Kerensky and Melby's "Education II," which calls for a complete restructuring of the educational system, is perhaps a bit too amorphous to assume concrete form in the real world of dwindling budgets, conflicting community interests, and the demand for a return to the "basics." What is left is practicable—shared school facilities that make both philosophical and financial sense, community cooperation in specific educational enterprises, and community schools operating in conjunction (and full cooperation) with established school systems.

It may be that community education and the use of existing facilities as community schools will become increasingly attractive as enrollments continue to drop. Decline and retrenchment could well motivate the educational establishment to serve a broader clientele in order to utilize fully existing resources, both personnel and facilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

ED numbers. Availability is noted, from the publisher or from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. To order from EDRS, specify the ED number, type of reproduction desired—microfiche (MF) or paper copy (HC), and number of copies. Add postage, figured at the following rates, to the cost of all orders and include check or money order payable to EDRS.

1st class: (MF only) 1-3, $0.15; 4-7, $0.28.

4th class: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, $0.48; each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.18; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $0.11 per each additional 75 pages.

UPS: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, not to exceed $1.04; each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.30; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $3.13 to $15.64 per each additional 75 pages.

EJ numbers. Availability is noted, from the publisher or from University Microfilms International (UMI), 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. To order from UMI, place orders through toll-free hotline (800) 521-0600 or prepay by cash, check, money order, or credit card. Specify quantity, EJ number, journal title, article title, and volume, issue, and date.

Anderson, Jackson M. "The Action Fronts in Community Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 160-62. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., Eighth St. and Union Ave., Bloomington, IN 47401. Complete issue, $1.25.

Andrews, Richard L., and Noack, Ernest G. S. "The Satisfaction of Parents with Their Community Schools as a Measure of Effectiveness of the Decentralization of a School System." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, February 1971. 10 pages. ED 047 371 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Baillie, Susan J.; DeWitt, Laurence B.; and O'Leary, Linda Schluter. *The Potential Role of the School as a Site for Integrating Social Services. A Report*. Syracuse, New York: Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse University Research Corporation, 1972. 148 pages. ED 081 088 MF $0.83 HC $7.35.

Barraclough, Terry. *Community Control of Schools. Educational Manage-*

ment Review Series Number 26. Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1972. 6 pages. ED 084 621 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Boozer, Raymond L. "Community Schools: Financing." In *The Role of the School in Community Education,* edited by Howard W. Hickey and Curtis Van Voorhees, pp. 85-94. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Campbell, Clyde M. "Community Schools: Their Administration." In *The Role of the School in Community Education,* edited by Howard W. Hickey and Curtis Van Voorhees, pp. 41-52. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Campbell, Clyde M. "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 195-97. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Carrillo, Tony S., and Heaton, Israel C. "Strategies for Establishing a Community Education Program." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 165-67. EJ 067 784. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Clark, Charles G. "Physical Facilities." In *The Role of the School in Community Education,* edited by Howard W. Hickey and Curtis Van Voorhees, pp. 96-104. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Clark, Phillip A. "Community Education Facility Planning." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 188-89. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Connelly, George W. "Community Education: Key to Administrative Decentralization?" *Community Education Journal,* 3, 4 (July 1973), pp. 16-17, 47. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Douglas, Leonard. "The Community School Philosophy and the Inner-School: A Challenge for Citizens and Educators." *Urban Education,* 5,4 (January 1971), pp. 328-35. EJ 034 139. Order reprints from UMI. $4.00. Additional copies of same article $1.00 each.

Ellena, William J. "The Emerging School Plant." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 54, 3 (November 1972), p. 189. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Ellis, Peter, and Sperling, John. "The Role of Community School Director as Organizer." *Community Education Journal,* 3, 1 (January 1973), pp. 55-56, 61. EJ 070 334. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American Scholar." In *The American Tradition in Literature,* edited by Sculley Bradley, Richard Croom Beatty, and E. Hudson Long, pp. 1098-1112. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1967.

Fantini, Mario D. "Participation, Decentralization, and Community Control." *National Elementary Principal*, 48, 5 (April 1969), pp. 25-31. EJ 003 568. Contact NAESP, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209. Complete issue, $4.00.

Gittell, Marilyn. *The Community School in the Nation. Community Issues*. New York: Queens College, City University of New York, 1970. 18 pages. ED 041 995 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Greene, Bert I. "Another View of Community Education." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 5 (September 1973), pp. 19-22. EJ 082 635. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Hansen, Al, and Cady, Daniel J. "Community School Concept." *Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers*, 15, 1 (January 1971), pp. 7-10. EJ 031 526. Order reprints from UMI, $4.00. Additional copies of same article $1.00 each.

Herrick, Mary. *The Rise of Community Schools in Urban Public Education*. New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1969. 27 pages. ED 040 220 MF $0.83 HC $2.06. Copies also available from National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 232 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016. $1.10.

Hiemstra, Roger. *The Educative Community. Linking the Community, School, and Family*. The Professional Education Series. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972. 116 pages. ED 078 575 MF and HC not available from EDRS. Copies available from Professional Educators Publications, Inc., Box 80728, Lincoln, NE 68501. Order No. 006-4, $1.75.

Hughes, John R., ed. *The Community School and Its Concepts*. Albany: Department of Educational Administration, State University of New York at Albany, [1972]. 12 pages. ED 073 531 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Kenney, James. "The Community School as a Base for the Coordination of Human Services Delivery." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 3 (May 1973), pp. 9-10, 60. EJ 078 621. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Kerensky, Vasil M. "Correcting Some Misconceptions about Community Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 158-60. EJ 067 801. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Kerensky, Vasil M., and Melby, Ernest O. *Education II—The Social Imperative*. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Kirby, John T. "Community Use of School Facilities." *Community Education Journal*, 1, 2 (May 1971), pp. 14-15. EJ 037 957. Not available. Journal no longer published.

LeTarte, Clyde E. "Federal Funds for Community Education: A Mixed Blessing." Manhattan: College of Education, Kansas State University. *Educational*

Talbot, Walter D. "Community Education: The Foundation of All Education." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 5 (September 1973), pp. 8-11, 46. EJ 082 633. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Totten, W. Fred, and Manley, Frank J. *The Community School Allied Education Council*. Galien, Michigan: 1969, p. 182.

Van Voorhees, Curtis. "Community Education Needs Research for Survival." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 203-5. EJ 068 919. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Warden, John W. "Guidelines for Evaluating the Community Education Process." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 5 (September 1973), pp. 34-37. EJ 082 637.

Watt, Leroy R. "A New Era: Community Education Goes Nation-wide." Manhattan: College of Education, Kansas State University. *Educational Considerations*, 2, 2 (Winter 1974), pp.10-11. Entire issue on Community Education, 20 pages. ED 105 548 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Weaver, Donald C. "A Case for Theory Development in Community Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 154-57. EJ 067 800. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Whitt, Robert L. *A Handbook for the Community School Director*. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Zimmerman, Herbert M. "The Community and the Schools: Who Are the Decision Makers?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 53, 337 (May 1969), pp. 169-75. EJ 004 178. Contact National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091. Complete issue, $4.00.

Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Pappadakis, Nick. "Financing Community Education." *Community Education Journal* 1, 2 (May 1971), pp. 37-41. EJ 037 934. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Pappadakis, Nick, and Totten, W. Fred. "Financing the New Dimensions of Community Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 192-94. EJ 068 154. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Passantino, Richard J. "Community/School Facilities: The Schoolhouse of the Future." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 56, 5 (January 1975), pp. 306-9. EJ 109 237. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Peebles, Robert W. "The Community School Then and Now." *Phylon*, 31, 2 (Summer 1970), pp. 157-67. EJ 023 599. Contact Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA 30314. Complete issue, $2.00.

Pendell, R. C. "Atlanta Pioneers a Community School Complex." *Community Education Journal*, 1, 2 (May 1971), pp. 29-36. EJ 038 558. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Ramsey, Russell W. "A Community School—Without Special Funding." *Community Education Journal*, 4, 1 (January-February 1974), pp. 30-32, 61. EJ 089 468. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Rigby, Avard A. "State Leadership in Community Education." Speech given at National Congress of Parents and Teachers annual meeting, Chicago, May 1972. 7 pages. ED 064 769 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Ringers, Joseph, Jr. "The Economics of Community/Schools." *American School & University*, 49, 6 (April 1977), pp. 60, 62, 64. EJ 157 034. Order reprints from UMI, $4.00. Additional copies of same article $1.00 each.

Robbins, Wayne R., and Whitaker, Donald. *A Guide for Community School Advisory Councils*. San Diego, California: San Diego Center for Community Education, San Diego County Department of Education, 1975. 9¾ pages. ED 106 926 MF $0.83 HC $4.67. Copies also available from Center for Community Education, Department of Education, San Diego County, 6401 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA 92111. $2.00.

Scanlon, David. "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education." In *Community Education: Principles and Practices from World-Wide Experience*, edited by Nelson B. Henry, pp. 38-63. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Schultz, Frederick M. "Community as a Pedagogical Enterprise and the Functions of Schooling within It in the Philosophy of John Dewey." *Educational Theory*, 21, 3 (Summer 1971), pp. 320-37. EJ 043 877. Contact University of Illinois, Education Building, Urbana, IL 61801. Complete issue, $4.00.

Considerations, 2, 2 (Winter 1974), pp. 15-16. Entire issue on Community Education, 20 pages. ED 105 548 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Lewis, Ed. "Community School: An Action Model for Combating Juvenile Delinquency." *Community Education Journal*, 3, 1 (January 1973), pp. 50-52. EJ 070 520. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Lovett, Tom. "Adult Education and the Community School." *Community Development Journal*, 6, 3 (Autumn 1971), pp. 183-85. EJ 048 554. Contact Oxford University Press, Press Rd., Neasdon, London NW10, England. Complete issue, $5.20.

Mattheis, Duane J. "Community Schools: New Hope for Education." Speech presented at National Community School Education Association national convention, St. Louis, November-December 1972. 15 pages. ED 071 191 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

McCloskey, Gordon. *Year-Round Community Schools: A Framework for Administrative Leadership*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, [1973]. 63 pages. ED 079 838 MF $0.83 HC $3.50. Copies also available from American Association of School Administrators, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209. Stock No. 021-00392, $4.00, quantity discount. Prepay all orders under $15. Include $1 handling charge.

Melby, Ernest O. "Approaches to Role Change in Community Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 171-72. EJ 067 455. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Mills, Nicolaus C. "Community Control in Perspective." *IRCD Bulletin*, 8, 5 (November 1972). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, Columbia University. 12 pages. ED 074 194 MF $0.83 HC $1.67.

Minzey, Jack. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 150-53. EJ 067 799. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Moore, Harold E. "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 168-70. EJ 067 454. Contact Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. See Anderson, above, for ordering information.

Myran, Gunder. "Educational Interlink: Community Services and Community School." *Community Education Journal*, 1, 2 (May 1971), pp. 42-46. EJ 038 559. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Nance, Everette E. "The Community Education Coordinator." *Community Education Journal*, 2, 5 (November 1972), pp. 52-55. EJ 067 066. Not available. Journal no longer published.

Olsen Edward G. "Enlivening the Community School Curriculum." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 54, 3 (November 1972), pp. 176-78. EJ 067 803. Contact